Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, independent claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 have been amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Crowley in view of Taccardi.

The claims have been amended to clarify that the therapy catheter is structured for coupling an electric field to a separate electric potential. Crowley neither teaches nor is structurally able to couple and maintain an electric field to successfully track the current location of the catheter from anywhere within the heart chamber.

The therapy catheter of the present invention works in conjunction with a pulsed signal generator to couple, by means of an electric field, the locator electrode to a separate electric potential for determining the location of that electrode at anytime. This element is missing from Crowley and Taccardi.

Crowley does not teach the delivery of an electric field but rather the delivery of acoustic energy. Also, Crowley's electrodes neither connect to nor operate in conjunction with any pulse generator. Thus, Crowley is structurally unable to generate a controlled field for the purposes of locating an electrode.

In addition, Crowley does not teach a locator electrode that is separate from the therapy electrodes, having a size and position adapted to deliver or receive a current pulse for coupling an electric field to continuously track the electrode. Crowley teaches electrodes for only potential sensing and ablation therapy. These activities, as taught by Crowley, are not reasonably successful if performed with the same electrode that is simultaneously carrying a pulsed current for coupling an electric field. As Crowley is structurally and functionally different, Applicants ask that claims 1, 2 and 5 be reconsidered in light of at least the reasons above.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Motamedi in view of Taccardi. Motamedi and Taccardi do not teach the delivery of an electric field for purposes of locating an electrode on a catheter from anywhere within a patient's heart. Motamedi's electrodes neither connect to nor operate in conjunction with any pulse generator. Thus, Motamedi is structurally unable to generate a controlled field for the purposes of locating an electrode.

In addition, Motamedi does not teach a locator electrode that is separate from the therapy electrodes, having a size and position adapted to deliver or receive a current pulse for coupling an electric field to continuously track the electrode, as recited in claim 3. Motamedi teaches electrodes for only potential sensing, ablation therapy, and pacing. These activities, as taught by Motamedi, are not reasonably successful if performed with the same electrode that is simultaneously carrying a pulsed current for coupling an electric field. Taccardi does not add anything that can overcome these deficiencies in Motamedi. For at least these reasons, Applicants ask that claim 3 be reconsidered.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Walinski in view of Taccardi. Walinski and Taccardi do not teach the delivery of an electric field for purposes of locating an electrode on a catheter from anywhere within a patient's heart. Walinski does not teach electrodes that connect to or operate in conjunction with any current pulse generator. Thus, Walinski is structurally unable to generate a controlled field for the purposes of locating an electrode.

In addition, Walinski does not teach a locator electrode that is separate from the therapy electrodes, having a size and position adapted to deliver or receive a current pulse for coupling an electric field to continuously track the electrode, as recited in claim 4. Walinski teaches a coaxial cable and antenna for potential sensing and ablation therapy. These activities, as taught by Walinski, are not reasonably successful if performed with the same electrode that is simultaneously carrying a pulsed current for coupling an electric field. Taccardi does not add anything that can overcome these deficiencies in Walinski. For at least these reasons, Applicants ask that claim 4 be reconsidered.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Michelle K. Holoubek
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 54,179

Date: 6/20/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

411331_1.DOC